

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is requested. Claims 1, 5, 7, and 11 have been amended. Support for amendments made herein may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0014-0017] of Applicants' Specification.

## **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

As requested by the Examiner, Applicants have resubmitted the IDS identified in Applicants' November 13, 2007 response.

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-2, 4-8 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,185,192 ("*Kahn*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,342 ("*Ho*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.<sup>1</sup>

In *Kahn*, a user (120-124) obtains access to resource server 200 via a login agent 305. The authentication authority 307 authenticates communications between the server 200 and the user. During the login process, login agent 305 obtains a user name and password from the user and validates this information against data in the user accounts database 350-2. Once validated, the login agent 305 assigns a default user identification number and user group number to the user.

---

<sup>1</sup> To be thorough, further expedite prosecution, and for the sake of clarity, Applicants provide discussions of each of the references separately, however, Applicants are not attacking these references individually, but arguing that the references, even taken in combination, fail to render the claimed invention obvious because all features of claim 1 are not found in the prior art.

While *Kahn* discloses a user identification number and a user group number assigned to the requester, each of these user identification number and user group number is assigned based on the user name and password entered by the user. At most, this login via user name and password is at the operating system level, but *not* at the level of the application program. In *Kahn* the system changes between users only by logging off and logging on at the *operating system level*. That is, the user must log off and a new user must log on using his or her user name and password to change between users.

Accordingly, the system of *Kahn* is not "configured to *change between users on a common authentication level by changing the documentation user object*, the users on the common authentication level having a common authentication user object," wherein the *documentation user objects identify users at the level of the application program*, as required by claim 1. To the contrary, as noted above, the system of *Kahn* only changes between users at the *operating system level*.

*Ho* discloses a method for retrieving sensitive stored data. Referring to FIGS. 2A-2B, when requesting data from a source terminal, the user enters information such as a password or other identifying information to verify the user's identity. Once verified, the user is then capable of accessing secure data. But, as discussed above with regard to *Kahn*, the authentication and documentation of the user in *Ho* is based wholly on the *user's login information* at the operating system level, which at most, determines data access right at the level of the operating system, *not* at the level of the application program.

*Ho's system only changes between users when a user logs off and a new user logs on at the operating system level. Accordingly, in Ho's system is also not "configured to change between users on a common authentication level by changing the documentation user object, the users on the common authentication level having a common authentication user object," wherein the documentation user objects identify users at the level of the application program, as required by claim 1.*

Because neither *Kahn* nor *Ho* discloses or suggests the above-described features, the combination of references fails to disclose or fairly suggest the above-described feature. For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentable over *Kahn* in view of *Ho*. Claims 5, 7 and 11 are patentable over *Kahn* in view of *Ho* for at least reasons somewhat similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 are patentable over *Kahn* in view of *Ho* at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 1, 5, 7 or 11.

#### **FURTHER PRIOR ART REJECTIONS**

Claims 3 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Kahn* in view of *Ho* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,892,307 ("*Wood*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed in that even assuming *arguendo* *Wood* could be combined with *Kahn* and/or *Ho* (which Applicants do not admit), *Wood* suffers from the same deficiencies as described above with regard to *Kahn* and *Ho*. Therefore, even in combination, the

references fail to teach or suggest all features of claim 1 or 7. Therefore, claims 3 and 9 are patentable over *Kahn, Ho* and/or *Wood*, taken singly or in combination.

### **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-12 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.


Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), applicant hereby petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$120.00 extension fee herewith.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Andrew M. Waxman, Reg. No. 56,007, at the number of the undersigned listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By  #56,007  
Donald J. Daley  
Reg. No. 34,313

DJD/AMW:krm

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, VA 20195  
(703) 668-8000